1	BEFORE THE							
2	ILLINOIS COMMERC	CE COMMISSION						
3	IN THE MATTER OF:							
4	DIANE WAMPLER,)						
	OPEN SOLUTIONS INC./NETRIX,)						
5)						
	COMPLAINANT,)						
6)						
	VS.)						
7)						
	ILLINOIS BELL TELEPHONE,) No. 13-0287						
8	COMPANY, D/B/A AT&T ILLINOIS,)						
	D/B/A/ AT&T WHOLESALE,)						
9)						
	RESPONDENT.)						
10)						
	Complaint as to billing/charges)						
11)						
	in Alsip, Illinois)						
12								
13								
14	Chicago, Ill	linois						
15	June 12, 2	2013						
16								
17	Met, pursuant to Notice, at 10:00 a.m.							
18								
19	BEFORE:							
20	MR. JOHN RILEY, Administrati	ive Law Judge						
21								
22								

1	APPEARANCES:
2	MR. JEFFREY WAMPLER (VIA TELEPHONE),
3	2801 Lakeside Drive
4	Bannockburn, Illinois 60015
5	appeared pro se;
6	MR. JAMES A. HUTTENHOWER
7	Senior Attorney, State Regulatory
8	AT&T ILLINOIS
9	225 West Randolph Street
10	Floor 25D
11	Chicago, Illinois 60606
12	(312) 727-1444
13	jh7452@att.com
14	appeared on behalf of the Respondent.
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	L.A. COURT REPORTERS, LLC, by
21	MR. JOSEPH T. MELARKEY, C.S.R.
22	License No. 084-000686

1				I	N	D	Ε	X	
2	Witnesses:								
3	None.								
4									
5									
6									
7									
8									
9									
10		E	Х	Η	I	В	I	Т	S
11	None.								
12									
13									
14									
15									
16									
17									
18									
19									
20									
21									

- JUDGE RILEY: Pursuant to the direction of the
- 2 Illinois Commerce Commission, I call Docket 13-0287.
- This is a complaint by Diane Wampler, Open
- 4 Solutions Inc./Netrix versus Illinois Bell Telephone
- 5 Company, D/B/A AT&T Illinois, D/B/A AT&T Wholesale, as to
- 6 billing/charges in Alsip, Illinois.
- 7 Mr. Wampler, you are still appearing without
- 8 an attorney, is that correct?
- 9 MR. WAMPLER (VIA TELEPHONE): That's correct.
- JUDGE RILEY: Would you state your business
- 11 address, for the record?
- MR. WAMPLER: 2801 Lakeside Drive, Bannockburn,
- 13 Illinois, 60015.
- JUDGE RILEY: Thank you.
- Mr. Huttenhower, for AT&T.
- MR. HUTTENHOWER: James Huttenhower,
- 17 H-U-T-T-E-N-H-O-W-E-R, 225 West Randolph Street, Suite 25-D,
- 18 Chicago, Illinois, 60606.
- JUDGE RILEY: Thank you.
- We have the amended formal complaint, Mr.
- Wampler, posted as of June 10th.
- From what I've been able to piece together

- from the transcript and everything that we've talked about,
- the only entity that had a contract with AT&T as a customer
- was Open Solutions, Inc., and that was dissolved in 2009
- 4 involuntarily according to the Secretary of State's office.
- Netrix was simply a billing agent contracted
- 6 with Open Solutions to take care of their billing matters,
- 7 and they had no contract with AT&T.
- Mr. Wampler, is it my understanding, did you
- 9 have any individual contract with AT&T?
- MR. WAMPLER: No.
- JUDGE RILEY: And not as a principal of Open
- 12 Solutions?
- MR. WAMPLER: No.
- JUDGE RILEY: Then the customer of AT&T is Open
- 15 Solutions, which no longer exists.
- Is there anything to go to hearing on?
- MR. WAMPLER: Well, again, I think that's why you
- asked me to prepare the amended complaint as an officer or
- 19 former officer, whatever term we want to use, of Open
- 20 Solutions.
- And, again, the text that I put in there
- was literally a cut and paste from the contract with AT&T

- is required by their own contract to notify us of a billing
- 2 rate increase, and they chose not to do that.
- JUDGE RILEY: Just to nail one more thing down,
- 4 Mr. Wampler, you are or were the President of Open
- 5 Solutions, Inc.?
- 6 MR. WAMPLER: That's correct.
- JUDGE RILEY: And there is no longer any entity
- 8 called Open Solutions, Inc., is that correct?
- 9 MR. WAMPLER: Correct.
- JUDGE RILEY: And it hasn't been revived?
- MR. WAMPLER: Correct.
- JUDGE RILEY: Mr. Huttenhower, anything?
- MR. HUTTENHOWER: A question I had, having seen
- the amended complaint, was sort of a variation of the
- question I had before which is, who is here?
- Mr. Wampler, having been an officer of Open
- 17 Solutions would be an appropriate person to bring a
- complaint on behalf of Open Solutions.
- I think - I can't remember Mr. Wampler's
- title with Netrix, but I think he was a principal and, as
- such, he would be an appropriate person to bring a complaint
- on behalf of Netrix had Netrix had a complaint to bring,

- but I guess, given what he filed earlier this week, I'm
- 2 not sure which hat he's wearing.
- The complaint doesn't say.
- 4 It just says Jeffrey Wampler and -
- 5 MR. WAMPLER: That's the way it was asked for me
- to prepare, Jeffrey Wampler, because, again, as we talked
- 7 about, it's dissolved.
- 8 AT&T is still performing the billing, whether
- 9 they're billing a legal entity, whether they're billing an
- individual, whether they're billing a subsidiary
- organization, they're producing a bill, and that bill is
- outside of the contract that was agreed to by both
- organizations.
- 14 JUDGE RILEY: Whose name is on the bill?
- MR. WAMPLER: Open Solutions.
- JUDGE RILEY: Open Solutions, correct, is still
- 17 a customer of AT&T and -
- MR. WAMPLER: Correct.
- 19 JUDGE RILEY: - and AT&T is something that is
- billed out, and you, as the president of this dissolved
- company, the bills are coming directly to you?
- MR. WAMPLER: Correct.

- JUDGE RILEY: Does your name appear on the bills
- 2 at all?
- MR. WAMPLER: It does not.
- 4 JUDGE RILEY: All right.
- MR. WAMPLER: It appears on the contracts.
- JUDGE RILEY: Right, on the contracts.
- 7 MR. WAMPLER: And we attached the contracts to
- 8 the complaint.
- JUDGE RILEY: And these are the contracts with
- 10 AT&T?
- MR. WAMPLER: Correct.
- JUDGE RILEY: You are the President of Open
- 13 Solutions, true?
- MR. WAMPLER: Correct.
- JUDGE RILEY: Mr. Wampler, you're still contesting
- the allegation - you're still alleging that AT&T
- improperly increased the amount of the billings to Open
- Solutions by more than 1,000 percent without the properly
- 19 required notice?
- MR. WAMPLER: Without the notice that's called
- 21 for within the contracts.
- JUDGE RILEY: Mr. Huttenhower, again, AT&T's

- 1 response to the complaint.
- MR. HUTTENHOWER: I believe that on the substance
- that we interpreted the contract correctly, and in addition
- 4 where the rate was reverting to what was obviously the
- 5 tariff liens as opposed to a rate in a contract, the serve
- 6 notice provision that Mr. Wampler relies on isn't
- ⁷ applicable.
- I guess - I don't want to harp on this
- 9 point. I just want to understand.
- So, Mr. Wampler, effectively, if I look at
- the first line of the complaint where it gives your name,
- 12 you're Jeffrey Wampler, suing as President of Open
- 13 Solutions?
- MR. WAMPLER: Correct.
- MR. HUTTENHOWER: Okay. Was notice ever issued?
- JUDGE RILEY: I'm sorry, what notice are you
- 17 referring to?
- MR. WAMPLER: Mr. Huttenhower, was any notice of
- a rate increase ever issued?
- Did you bill it at one rate and then bill it
- 21 at a subsequent rate without notice of any kind?
- MR. HUTTENHOWER: I know that - well, certainly

- the bills would have given some indication of what
- 2 happened.
- I know that there has been some
- 4 correspondence between AT&T and your company about certain
- 5 contracts coming up for, you know, that they were expiring,
- 6 and the rates could change or resolve.
- 7 I don't recall whether this particular
- 8 account was called out by name.
- 9 MR. WAMPLER: Do you have any documentation to
- 10 support the notice on this particular account that a rate
- increase was provided to Open Solutions, Jeff Wampler, or
- 12 anybody associated with the contract?
- MR. HUTTENHOWER: I'm not sure that's - if you
- want discovery from AT&T, you're certainly welcome to send
- it to us, but sort of asking me on the record when I'm
- 16 not - I'm just a lawyer and not somebody who -
- MR. WAMPLER: Well, that's the complaint.
- The complaint is that the rate increase
- took place without the required notice, so the question is:
- 20 Do you have any proof of any notice given to us regarding
- 21 a rate increase?
- JUDGE RILEY: That's the issue that's going to be

- decided at hearing.
- MR. WAMPLER: Correct.
- JUDGE RILEY: Right.
- 4 MR. WAMPLER: Because the whole reason this came
- about, the only reason we're taking everyone's time, like
- I told you walking down the hallway, it's a ridiculous
- 7 waste of time, and as soon as we received the bill, we
- 8 entered a cancellation notice.
- 9 So, the reason that we entered the
- cancellation notice is we didn't accept your rate increase.
- So, if we want to go to hearing or wherever
- 12 we want to go, the bottom line is that we can continue to
- take each other's time, but the bottom line is, it doesn't
- make sense to me.
- MR. HUTTENHOWER: I guess, Judge, what I would
- suggest, well, it's two-fold.
- 17 There's a chance that I might decide that I
- have a basis to move to dismiss this complaint since I just
- 19 saw it 45 minutes ago, I need to think about that.
- But what you could do, I suppose, is give
- me a deadline to do that, and then also set a date for
- hearing so that if I don't file a motion to dismiss, then

- we have that date set as well.
- JUDGE RILEY: Right. You're not sure how you're
- going to proceed at this point, is that what you're saying?
- 4 MR. HUTTENHOWER: Right. There may be a basis
- for me to move to dismiss, but I'm not sure right now.
- JUDGE RILEY: All right. Mr. Wampler, do you
- 7 understand what Mr. Huttenhower is saying?
- MR. WAMPLER: Absolutely.
- JUDGE RILEY: Mr. Huttenhower, can you give me
- any kind of a timeframe at all as to when you'll make up
- 11 your mind?
- MR. HUTTENHOWER: Two weeks.
- JUDGE RILEY: Two weeks. So, you think roughly
- 14 by - is it the 26th or the 27th?
- Why don't we just give it to the end of the
- month.
- Why don't we give it to Friday, the 28th.
- MR. HUTTENHOWER: Okay. That's fine.
- MR. WAMPLER: I will be out of town on Friday,
- the 28th, so I get back - I don't know that anyone's
- working except me, but the week of the 4th, I'll be back,
- so all but the 4th, so other than that -

- JUDGE RILEY: That shouldn't compromise anything
- that's going to be done because you'll still be able to
- get - this is going to be Mr. Huttenhower, if he files
- a motion to dismiss, and he will it file it by the 28th.
- MR. WAMPLER: Okay.
- JUDGE RILEY: And you'll have - I'll send out
- 7 a ruling after that, giving you plenty of time to respond
- 8 to the motion.
- 9 MR. WAMPLER: Okay.
- JUDGE RILEY: So, even if you're going to be
- out of town on the 28th, you can pick up the motion when
- 12 you get back.
- MR. WAMPLER: Okay.
- JUDGE RILEY: You can take it from there.
- In the meantime -
- MR. WAMPLER: Okay.
- JUDGE RILEY: So, if you're going to make up your
- mind by June 28th as to whether you're going to file a
- motion to dismiss, Mr. Huttenhower?
- MR. HUTTENHOWER: Right.
- JUDGE RILEY: Mr. Wampler, as I said, if that
- 22 motion posts on the Commission e-Docket system, I'll give

- 1 you at least two weeks to respond to it.
- MR. WAMPLER: Okay.
- JUDGE RILEY: And, in the meantime, so that will
- 4 take us to pretty much about the 12th of July, and then
- 5 I'll probably give Mr. Huttenhower another week to respond
- 6 to that, if he decides to make any response, and that will
- take us to the 19th, and we'll just set a date for hearing.
- MR. WAMPLER: Are we going to set the date for
- 9 hearing today?
- JUDGE RILEY: I would like to.
- MR. WAMPLER: Okay.
- JUDGE RILEY: But I want to set it a good ways
- down the road.
- 14 It will be well after the 19th, so it will
- give me a chance to digest the motion to dismiss and the
- responses, and I'd like a few days to do that.
- 17 Is there any one day in the week that's good
- 18 for you, Mr. Wampler?
- MR. WAMPLER: No. I mean, I'm fine with any day.
- JUDGE RILEY: Some days are busier than others.
- MR. WAMPLER: Monday is still the only bad day,
- if you want to talk about a bad day.

- JUDGE RILEY: Why don't we look towards the end
- of July.
- MR. HUTTENHOWER: The week of the 29th?
- 4 JUDGE RILEY: That's what I was looking at, right.
- How about the 30th, July 30th, a Tuesday?
- 6 MR. WAMPLER: What time?
- JUDGE RILEY: 10:00 a.m.
- 8 MR. WAMPLER: Okay.
- JUDGE RILEY: That depends upon - it's going
- to depend upon the ruling on the motion to dismiss.
- MR. WAMPLER: Sure.
- JUDGE RILEY: So, the procedure would be, if I
- choose to - not choose, but if I believe that the motion
- should be denied, I will simply send out a notice of an
- 15 ALJ ruling denying the motion.
- If I believe the motion should be granted,
- what I will do is send out a proposed order to the parties.
- And, Mr. Wampler, that will give you time
- 19 to provide exceptions, and Mr. Huttenhower will have a
- 20 chance to provide exceptions to my reasons for granting
- 21 the motion.
- Once I receive your exceptions, I will

- incorporate those into the order, and I will submit that
- order to the Commission for their disposition.
- So, I can deny the motion to dismiss.
- I cannot grant the motion to dismiss. That
- 5 has to go through the Commission.
- So, anyway, that's the procedure. But for
- 7 right now, what we'll wait for is whether or not AT&T is
- going to file a motion to dismiss by June 28th, and that's
- 9 our target date.
- That will allow us to set in motion, for
- lack of a better word, the chain of events.
- MR. WAMPLER: Okay.
- JUDGE RILEY: We'll just wait and see if AT&T
- files a motion to dismiss by June 28th, and we'll respond
- accordingly.
- MR. WAMPLER: Okay. Thank you, guys.
- JUDGE RILEY: Thank you very much.
- MR. WAMPLER: Thank you.

19

20

21

22